

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

February 8, 2005

7:00 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Lopez

Messrs.: R. MacKenzie, K. Sheppard, S. Tellier, S. Maranto, T. Clougherty,
E. Krueger, T. Svantesson

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$2,000,000 (Other) for CIP 730201 Property Acquisition Project.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$50,000 (Other) for FY2001 CIP 840001 MCTV-PEG Access Grant Project.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorizations transferring funds in the amount of \$150,000 (Enterprise) for the 2003 CIP 712103 S. Mammoth Sewer – Phase 3 Project.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and

expenditure of funds in the amount of \$26,923.08 (State) for FY2005 CIP 411605 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization transferring funds in the amount of \$45,000 (CDBG) for the 2005 CIP 510305 Parks & Recreation Master Plan Project.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked Mr. MacKenzie what is the relationship between this particular plan and the City Master Plan. Will it be implemented with it? Will it be in conjunction with it? What is the timing of it?

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director answered the results of this will actually flow into the City's Master Plan. This looks at all of the parks City-wide and makes recommendations on those and then a summary of that will be put in to the City's Master Plan. That is what we did in 1992 and 1993. There was a major parks plan and that information went into the City's Master Plan.

Alderman Shea asked when is the City's Master Plan going to be implemented, started or organized or discussed.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we are hoping to start that this year. There are several other major studies, such as the Downtown Strategy and the Economic Strategy that will feed into it and once those are underway, and those will take about six months to complete, we should be starting the City's Master Plan sometime in that time period. Probably late spring or early summer.

Chairman O'Neil stated and if I recall I don't think Ron has to come up but the timeframe for this would be early to mid fall for delivery of the final document after all of the public participation meetings. So everything seems like it will flow into the Master Plan.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$219,800 (Other & CDBG) for the CIP 613205 Downtown & Economic Strategies Report.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. MacKenzie this is that Economic Strategies Committee that was put together and I think there are two Aldermen on it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there will be what we call a sounding board. Right now there is a small steering committee. It has a couple of City people. There will be a larger sounding board that will have two Aldermen and representatives from the Chamber of Commerce and Citizens and as soon as these studies are activated we will be putting together that sounding board.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the Chairman of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen appointed myself to that Board. I was wondering if there could be some type of scheduling once you get the necessary documentation as to what these meetings will be and when they will be and all of that.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes. We will have a fairly standardized schedule. Probably for a six-month period we hope to have that sounding board meet at least once a month. These are fairly major studies – the Downtown Strategy and the Economic Strategy and we will hope to meet with consultants and everybody else at least once a month.

Alderman Lopez stated the second part of the question is when you were saying Downtown Economic Strategy are we talking about expanding the entire area when we are talking about like JacPac and everything else.

Mr. MacKenzie responded the two studies...the Economic Strategy really is Citywide. It goes all the way from the Airport up to Hackett Hill trying to device a strategy that we should take for a 10-year period. The Downtown Plan is actually a somewhat bigger geographic area than we normally consider the downtown and a special focus to get that done quickly is the JacPac site. What are the best uses for the JacPac site and what should we encourage there.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$10,225 (Other) for the 2005 CIP 810305 VISTA Coordinator Project.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorization:

410505 NH DWI Patrol Program – Revision #2

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning requesting CIP project extensions be extended from December 31, 2004 to June 30, 2005 as follows:

411904 Project Safe Neighborhoods – Revision #1

412004 Speed Enforcement – Revision #2

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the project extensions.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from Aldermen Garrity and O'Neil requesting the Highway Department review the situation at the intersection of So. Willow and So. Maple Streets and report back to the Committee with recommendations for improvements and estimated costs.

Alderman Shea asked is that the area when you take a left cars are coming off of South Willow and taking a right in front of PJ O'Sullivan's.

Chairman O'Neil answered if you have ever tried to cross from that parking lot where people exit and I am not sure of the name of that first street off of South Maple...Brunelle, it is tough. If they have the green light they are coming around that corner pretty good. I know that Frank Thomas took a look at it. Kevin, is there anything you want to add? I know that Frank looked at it and thought there might be...I won't say a simple recommendation but...

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, stated we have taken a quick look at it. It appears that something can be done there. One of the issues is that the mast arm and the existing island to the intersection would have to be relocated or possibly need a new mast arm. We are getting a survey on that right now and will put together an estimate for that work.

Alderman Garrity stated our intent is we had the same problem on South Willow and South Lincoln and our intent is to try to make it a little safer.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think you came up with a little more of a 90° turn there, which seemed to improve things.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from Steven Tellier, Chairman of the Board of Assessors, requesting that the City Hall Complex west wing conference room (first floor) be allocated to the Board of Assessors in order to meet space requirements.

Alderman Lopez stated I think all we are approving tonight is letting you use the space without putting a door in because I don't think any money has been allocated for that and we don't know what the cost is going to be. Have you worked with Building Maintenance or anything?

Steve Tellier, Chairman, Board of Assessors stated I have worked with Tim Clougherty. He is getting a couple of bids right now. He placed a verbal feeling of \$15,000 but it could be a little less than \$10,000. I have a small sketch here for your information and I can verbalize what the work would entail.

Chairman O'Neil responded we have that information on the agenda.

Mr. Tellier stated it would require opening up the wall, cutting through a lower portion of brick, fitting in a door and some additional rudimentaries. The cost would be in the cost of the door itself, a glass panel door that would allow some natural daylight and the labor of cutting that brick. They would have to do it on the weekend. It would require a wet saw and probably some sheeting so it wouldn't be a mess and it would have to be done on the weekend.

Alderman Lopez responded I guess what I am concerned with is first of all the space is there. It has been used by everybody. Secondly, you need a door. I can't see that costing \$10,000.

Mr. Tellier replied I am sure it will be much less than that.

Alderman Lopez stated I would consider if you would take another look about putting a door in. That space has been used by the City Clerk and it has been used by other numerous people over the years with no problems whatsoever. I think you need it for a functional office and as it is now it is a functional office. Unless somebody wants to come up with \$10,000 and give it to you I would work on a) what is the door going to cost to put in and b) what the cosmetics are going to be.

Mr. Tellier replied absolutely. I will have those bids for you at the next meeting.

Chairman O'Neil asked doesn't this, if I recall, and I could be totally wrong but doesn't it have to do with the upcoming revaluation project in order to better serve the public.

Mr. Tellier answered it would lend itself to that as well as some of the employees we have right now are in foyer areas and this would allow more office space.

Chairman O'Neil stated I thought the primary intent was the revaluation and public access and the public's ability to come down and provide space to meet with...that is what I was told.

Mr. Tellier responded that would all lend itself to that as well.

Alderman Forest stated I have a comment. I don't know whether it is going to cost \$10,000 or not and I am not an engineer but from what I understand that wall is a load bearing wall so if they open it up they might have to put a truss across there to take the weight of the second floor so that may be where that expense comes in and I think that is only an estimate as far as that wall.

Mr. Tellier responded actually we are very lucky. It is a false finish wall. It is a metal stud and sheetrock. Behind it is a window opening with the lintel and the crown at the top. It would just require taking the bricks out at the bottom. We absolutely could use the room in its present format but it just requires us to go in through the hallway. This would provide a continuous...by putting a door in it would flow well for our staff. I will get some bids in. If the price isn't too onerous, I hope the Committee will support it. If it is too much, we will just work with it the way it is.

Chairman O'Neil asked and you are working with the Facilities Division of the Highway Department.

Mr. Tellier answered yes.

Alderman Shea stated it does say referred to the Committee on Lands and Buildings for funding. I am not sure...

Chairman O'Neil interjected they were okay with the concept. I am not on Lands and Buildings but my recollection is they approved the concept of this subject to funding to do the improvements. Am I correct?

Mr. Tellier responded the Mayor approved it in collaboration with the City Clerk. Just to inform the Board I went to the City Clerk to find out how many times that facility had been used in 2004. It was whopping seven times and four of those times were by the Assessors. That facility is not used a great deal of time.

Alderman Shea asked so where is it, in Lands and Buildings.

Mr. Tellier answered it is out of there. It is here.

Chairman O'Neil stated they referred it here. They approved it I thought.

Mr. Tellier stated yes they approved it. It is out of that Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated I know what happened if I may. Something like this is operational with the staff here. They very well could have solved this problem individually with the CEO and the department head. The only thing is it had come before us at Lands and Buildings because they didn't handle it. We said we would give them the space and they were to work from there.

Chairman O'Neil responded but they are also looking for some funding for this. That is why it is here. I have no problem with it being here.

Alderman Lopez stated the point I wanted to make is if you take a look at a) and b).

Mr. Tellier replied we can work with it as is. Hopefully the funding costs will be minimal and the Board can approve it.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is here so bring it back to us.

Alderman Lopez stated I would ask that this be approved so that he can proceed and if the funding can't be worked out with anybody then he can come back to us for the funding.

Chairman O'Neil asked Steve isn't it my understanding that you are reaching out to the CIP Committee for funding for this project.

Mr. Tellier answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated there isn't any funding in the departments. That is why it is here. They are reaching out to us to help them identify some funding. We can't approve any funding or even ask staff to look at it until we know what the estimated truly are. They are very preliminary at this point and he is working with the Facilities group to come up with a better number before they ask us for the money. It does belong here. They are asking for money.

Alderman Shea moved to table this item.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. Maranto if he has weighed in on any of this.

Sam Maranto stated no because he hasn't requested any funding yet.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion to table. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Communication from the Airport Director requesting approval to expend \$5,400 to purchase a used 1996 tractor to replace a 1979 International tractor that is used to relocate the airport's portable snowmelters.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Andrew Sullivan submitting a revised petition for the alteration of a portion of Hillcrest Avenue to change from a Class VI to Class V highway.

Alderman Garrity asked could we get an update from Highway.

Mr. Sheppard stated I don't have an update. I know that we have seen some plans but no acceptable plan or guarantees have been submitted to us to date so this is basically still on hold at our office.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 16 of the agenda:

Sewer abatement request (33 High Ridge Road).

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the sewer abatement request in the amount of \$337.90 as recommended by EPD.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 17 of the agenda:

Sewer abatement request (91 Lilac Court).

(Note: EPD recommends deferral at this time due to unavailability of consumption history which should be available in May of 2005.)

Alderman Shea moved to table.

Mr. Sheppard stated you have two options. You could table it or you could receive and file it and request that the person submit another abatement request once there is some history on the property.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Kevin, you are working with these people and asking them to get some better information.

Mr. Sheppard answered we have informed them about the deduct meter program and I think that is the issue they have is that they didn't have a deduct meter so they were paying. We informed them and requested that they use that so they will see that savings.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 18 of the agenda:

Discussion relating to long-range CIP planning.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have tried to program out some of our major expected capital projects in the City. That is where the spreadsheet...we have the larger copy. Hopefully you are not trying to read the one in the agenda because it is a little small. If I could just summarize a few things, one is that there are some very major projects in the Enterprise program.

Chairman O'Neil asked did you give us a handout at our last CIP meeting.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes it was a larger, longer sheet.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have any extra copies.

Mr. MacKenzie answered Sam has a few extra copies. If you look across the columns, we have looked out five years from FY06 through FY10 and we have broken it down in each of those by CDBG and HOME, Bond, Enterprise and Cash. We have tried to assemble information from all of the departments as to what they expect over that period. CDBG if I could just talk about that. I will be providing a letter to the full Board because there are some very serious issues going on with funding for cities like Manchester in the current Congressional budget process. The President's proposal would most likely cut CDBG by over \$1 million and there are a lot of other programs that could be cut for the city. That will be a serious issue for the Board to talk about. In this program you will see that FY06 under Bond...

Alderman Shea interjected when will the decision be made at the Federal government that we will get less than \$1 million. In other words, would that conflict with our budget?

Mr. MacKenzie responded it will not affect us for FY06 because that money is already allocated by the Federal government but it will be affecting us in FY07. Under the bonding each year we have tried to live within the parameters that have been given to us by the Finance Director and Bond Counsel, which is in essence a bond of \$10 million a year. In that, some of the major projects we have shown across the five-year period. The most major one is a new Public Works facility. The existing facility is very antiquated. It is getting more and more difficult to meet safety standards and the Highway Department has been working with a couple of other departments to see if there is a suitable site and a way to build it. So we have shown funding for that particular facility over several years and have fit it within the cap. Across the line you will see in FY06 if you follow the bond column down there is \$250,000, which we would likely have to bond for the reveal that the Board has talked about. Across in FY07 and FY08 you can see that we have attempted to stay within the \$10 million mark per year. Again, it may be proposed again that we do a two year bond budget but for this planning purpose we have shown it year by year. What we have not been able to fit in at this point are items below...you can see that there are six items on the lower part that have not fit into that \$10 million budget yet. A major increase for the MER, the motorized equipment for the City. There is still a request for a police building expansion. There will be need for additional money for the Granite Street project – somewhere between \$2 and \$3 million. The School Administration is looking again at its capacity needs, particularly for elementary and will be bringing in future requests and that is not in here. There is a request for an annex to the main library at \$16 million and for renovation or new construction for the West Side Library. I guess the bad news...to get back to the original question about why we are sitting up front, the bad news is we have not found a way to fit

that into our long-range plans at this point. For now, I am just going to pause to see if you have questions on what I have talked about.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a couple of comments. One regarding the MER. I thought one of the game plans going forward was we would be paying with the fiscal year conversion bond being paid off next year maybe or maybe this year.

Mr. MacKenzie responded actually this year.

Chairman O'Neil stated I thought one of the game plans we discussed was taking some of that money and maybe items that we would traditionally bond such as a fire truck or a dump truck or a front-end loader or something like that that we might pay cash for them.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes and that is a good point. I think that has been the plan.

Chairman O'Neil stated also vehicles that we normally pay cash for like getting some more police cruisers. Secondly, I thought there was a game plan with Granite Street that if it didn't come under budget...I thought Frank sat here with the consultant one night and presented a game plan that said he had a contingency and if it came in and I don't know if Kevin wants to jump in on this but if it didn't come in that we would not do the improvements between Canal and Elm and that was somewhere over \$1 million. They felt that they would meet budget on it other than that portion of the project. My understanding was it was aesthetic improvements and there were not additional lanes or anything done.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think the latest estimates had already included engineering down the project. There will still be a need as I understand it for an additional \$2 million at least.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is not how I recall that it was presented. Kevin Sheppard are you going to jump in here?

Mr. Sheppard stated from what I remember the original bid or estimates came in and they were high. I believe Frank came before this Committee with the consultant explaining that the bids were high. What we were looking to do was break the project into three separate projects. The first being done with the state and hopefully bringing that cost down. The second being the bridge only and bringing that cost down and the third being from Commercial up to Elm Street. That would be the last phase of the project. It depends on how the bids come in but the estimates are still showing that there is a need for additional money for that project. I am not too sure how much we are looking for.

Chairman O'Neil responded we should get an update on that because I look to my colleagues but my recollection was that it was going to be brought in under budget and

we didn't need to...you had gone back and asked them to redesign and get rid of some of the frills. There was like \$1 million in brick sidewalks and some type of curbing but if I recall and again I stand corrected if I am wrong...

Alderman Shea interjected I think you are correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated we need to check on that. We were led to believe that the initiative you were taking would bring it in close and there might have been a \$1 million difference and if there was Frank's recommendation was going to be that we did not do the improvements or we do not do the improvements between Canal and Elm Street because they were generally aesthetic and it wouldn't be any additional driving lanes or anything.

Mr. Sheppard replied what I can do is get a memo together for the Committee regarding that.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think that would be helpful. I don't think Bob and Sam are wrong here but I think we need to better coordinate this. I do appreciate the fact that they are laying out some of the issues that we are not addressing. I think it would just be good for us to know.

Alderman Shea stated just to reinforce what you are saying, in November 2004 we did meet with Frank and what the Chairman is stating is correct. Frank did indicate that he was hoping that because he was joining bids with the state it would allow a contingency to be available and then as Alderman O'Neil indicated there would be funding available to do certain work but not necessarily aesthetic. I think, Mr. MacKenzie, that the request you have may or may not be according to what we understood it to be.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would like to get that clarified. I would like to be wrong in this case but I saw the original cost estimates and they were up around \$25 million. We have in available funding roughly \$19 million. They were able to engineer down a few million but we are still a couple of million dollars short on the project.

Chairman O'Neil asked Planning and Highway to get together on that. Unless something has changed in the last month that is what we were led...if I recall there could have been a \$1 million difference but Frank thought that could be addressed in the Canal to Elm Street portion of the project.

Mr. Sheppard stated I think Frank is hoping that by breaking the bids out we will save some money. Let me verify that and get back to you.

Alderman Lopez stated on the major projects not included we noted that for the main library the money is there correct.

Mr. MacKenzie responded for the existing heating, ventilation and minor improvements, yes the money is there for that.

Alderman Lopez asked so you are talking another \$16 million.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. They have requested a major addition to the Library.

Alderman Lopez asked the West Side Library...I guess for \$16 million and how much did we just give them, \$3.1 for the ventilation, and they want \$16 million more.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked to do what.

Mr. MacKenzie answered they would be building a roughly \$35,000 square foot new addition to the back of the library.

Alderman Lopez stated when I look at this...have you arranged these by priority.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have gone to the departments and gotten their priorities. We have not prioritized these projects down below here because they are still a little bit up in the air. We expect these projects for the next five-year planning period. The reason we did include the MER and I would add, Mr. Chairman, that you are correct. It looks as though we can allocate probably \$1 million a year but right now we are about \$4 million behind the eight ball for new equipment. Somehow we either have to put in more cash each year or somehow make up for that because we are behind quite a bit on new fire trucks, new dump trucks and everything else.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you coordinate with Finance and update us at the next meeting. I can't remember what that...what was the debt service on that bond yearly.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is about \$3 million and Finance had recommended that perhaps \$1 million go for MER type equipment and Information Systems equipment and they had recommended that \$1 million go into capital reserve.

Chairman O'Neil stated that would allow us down the road once that reserve fund got built up to purchase bonded equipment.

Alderman Lopez stated I think you have to readdress that because I do know that the reserve fund was received and filed in one of the Committees. I think it was Administration. So somebody should come in and talk about the conversion bond. Police building expansion – is that still on the books?

Mr. MacKenzie responded they have still requested it yes. It is near the top of their priority list.

Alderman Lopez stated I guess what I am saying is I know the department has requested it but if you had half of the money to do some of these would you be making recommendations as to the priority of these projects.

Mr. MacKenzie responded we are looking for, in essence, some feedback from the Board members. We can make recommendations to you. Generally we have already made some assumptions in the fact that the Highway Department, for example, is in fairly poor condition and they are trying to cover and provide a lot of services to the City and at some point we do have to build a new garage so we have made that assumption and tried to build it into the program. Some of the other ones are still up in the air. For example, school facilities. They are still going through that process of trying to figure out what to do and the new library addition is a relatively new request so we have not programmed it in yet. I think that is something the Board will have to discuss further and work with us to see where the priorities are.

Alderman Lopez stated my last question would be on the West Side Library. Everybody knows that they are going to have to do some maintenance on that. Is Tim Clougherty here? When we look at the money we are paying for the main library there may be some funds where he can do some...I know we are putting a new roof over there now but maybe they could get the inside of that place fixed up with the existing money. Has that been talked about or can you do that or do you need approval to throw the West Side Library in with that? Whatever you can do to get it up to par so they can use it.

Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager, stated as you will see later on in your agenda we have the update for the library project that you are referencing. At this point in time we haven't received bids on it. We do have our architect's and engineer's estimates on it and it is within budget. Until we receive bids we won't know exactly how much it is cost – maybe a little bit more or maybe a little bit less. If it does come in to be a little bit less than certainly we could use those funds if we had a healthy contingency and we could look at using those funds to accommodate some of the upgrades to the West Side Library. I think that we would request Planning to put an amendment to the CIP start-up form to allow us to do that.

Chairman O'Neil asked Tim are those improvements identified at the West Side Library.

Mr. Clougherty answered we have some improvements identified on our CIP request. I don't have a copy of that with me so I can't speak to it.

Chairman O'Neil asked is this kind of just a general they know that something needs to happen.

Mr. Clougherty answered there is something that needs to happen. The extent of those renovations is really up to the will of the Committee because it was obviously housing the food service program and the community center it is not exactly fit up to be a library so there would be some alterations and improvements that would be wise to make.

Alderman Lopez stated whatever you could do if we gave the authority for you to do something with contingency funds over there in order to get it in working condition.

Mr. Clougherty responded that would be fine. What we could do is much like we are doing with the school project. As the project moves along if we are not using a lot of contingency funds than perhaps we could reallocate some of those monies to the West Side.

Chairman O'Neil stated but you won't know that now for several months at this point.

Mr. Clougherty responded at least until we receive bids and then depending on how those bids come in what kind of monies are left for contingency and unforeseen conditions with that project.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can continue discussion with the library portion of this when Tim and Eric and Kevin come up later. They are going to update us on the two big projects going on.

Alderman Smith stated I know everyone has a wish list. You are meeting with the various departments right now. When will you be coming back with a recommendation to the CIP Committee? Mid-March?

Mr. MacKenzie responded the next step in the process will be for the Mayor to present his CIP budget for the FY06. That should be coming in...I might turn to Carol perhaps. I am not sure if she knows. Mid to late March the Mayor will present both his operating budget and CIP budget.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated March 28.

Alderman Smith asked when a priority list comes in for a certain department, it might not be the top priority that gets your wish or whatever it is or the Mayor's recommendation might have that down the road for quite awhile. You will present it to us for implementation or approval but you are trying to find out...I am sure you know my wish list already but you are trying to get a feeling from this Committee on what we think is very responsible to the needs of the City right now?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes we are. There are issues and I know you spoke with me about Raco-Theodore pool perhaps will need some additional monies. We are going to be trying to work those additional funds with the Mayor into the FY06 budget. So there are several smaller projects that would normally be bonded this year but we have no bonding, additional bonding so we are going to be trying to work those with the available funds that we have, which is primarily cash or CDBG.

Chairman O'Neil stated Bob I know you have done this before but I don't know to this extent but I think this lays out a very good picture of the next several years for us and I think it is very helpful in some of the decisions we are making so I appreciate it.

Alderman Lopez asked on the bonding in FY07 you say you need \$30 million and I think you said you have about \$10 million for FY07 in bonding correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to see from a viewpoint as to...and I am not naïve I know the Aldermen, that each Alderman in their ward wants things okay and that is fine and good but with \$30 million needed and you only have \$10 million I would like to see what are the essential things we need in the City versus a ward Alderman wanting something and I am not being disrespectful to any of them but is it something that is essential to the City like paving the roads, fixing the streets, police vehicles, all of those things versus maybe holding off in FY07 and FY08 and trying to figure out when we are going to do the rest of our parks and whatever the case may be. I think you get the drift of my question. What is the most for the community that we need to be doing? It seems...I have been here six years and we are never going to get there. We need \$40 million one year and we need \$30 million the next year. I just don't know how you get there and the School Department is going to need \$105 million. Is there some way in Planning that we could put a category saying these are the essentials for the City that are important to the City as a whole? These are the nice things to have and these are on the wish list.

Mr. MacKenzie responded I look at CIP programming in any City and I would say that half of it is professionally based. The Fire Department says we need this new fire station renovated because it is falling apart. The other 50% is politically based. What are the wishes of the elected officials of the City? Do we want to move ahead with the new Public Works garage or do we want to build a new library addition? We can have comments on that 50% that is political but it is kind of an iterative process. We can give you our best judgements and you can work with that but in essence some of the big decisions have to come down to you as elected officials. What are most important to your constituents in terms of City services?

Alderman Shea stated I want to continue, Bob. We depend on people like you to give us sound judgement in terms of how we can best shape the community and the quality of life of people. That is what he is hitting upon and I think that so often we get calls about conditions of this particular vote or that particular safety issue and so forth and we have to weigh that against whether or not we want to provide for a facility such as a library or such as an addition for vehicles for the Public Works Department and so forth. I think that this is...what he is hinting at is we don't necessarily have to vote on what you are saying but we sort of look to you as we look to the man in back of you, Ron Ludwig, for park situations or at Kevin Sheppard regarding highway concerns and so forth. I think that you can't, in a sense, shift the responsibility fully upon us and say you know here is everything and there is no real priority list. I think that is what I am trying to get at. We depend on you and what you said is true, 50% and the other 50% may be politically motivated in terms of politicians wanting to do whatever is in their best interest as it were or in the constituent's best interest.

Mr. MacKenzie responded I do understand that and we will give you the best professional advice that we can on these projects. We don't have a problem making tough calls and recommending one project over another. We will do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Garrity and I were just kind of having a little bit of a side conversation about the Hackett Hill Road Fire Station. My personal opinion, until we are 100% sure what is going to happen in that whole area, it would be, I don't want to say irresponsible by us but we may end up putting a fire station somewhere and then 10 years later through the development that has happened that fire station is not best situated to serve that area. So although Hackett Hill has been on here for years, until we 100% are sure what is going to happen in that area of the City in my opinion it wouldn't be responsible to build a new fire station. We do know that Calef Road needs some rehab. There are a lot of other factors involved here as well. This is very helpful. If we haven't I think it might be helpful just to get out to the full Board both spreadsheets. It gets us thinking about the future of the City.

Alderman Shea stated I just want to comment to that CIP members change with the new elections so if there is a guidance in terms of what direction the CIP members could possibly take because we are not going to be here, all of us necessarily, on this Committee so it is essential that there be some sort of way of new members getting it, if there are, an idea of what is essential and not essential in your judgement.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know one of the things in my discussions with Ron Ludwig about the Parks Master Plan, Parks has asked them to prioritize the needed improvements in the City to somewhat take the politics out of it to make sure we are addressing the true needs as both Alderman Shea and Alderman Lopez talked about. I think that is going to be helpful to us. I think we are making strides in that and I want to thank both of you for your time.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 19 of the agenda:

Status update on the Library renovation and the South Main Street Fire Station project to be provided by Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager.

Mr. Clougherty stated with me tonight is the newest addition to our staff, Eric Krueger. He is our Facilities Superintendent and Eric is running this project. He is responsible for it from our department's standpoint. To this point, things are going well. We are about 90% through the design of the library project. In front of you, you can see as I mentioned before our architect's estimates for the cost. Just running through them quickly we are looking at heating and HVAC in the \$2.1 million range; rain gutter reconstruction roughly \$300,000; stair and exterior cleaning \$172,000 and \$150,000 respectively. We have an allowance in there for hazardous materials at \$25,000 and our design, which is a fixed fee of \$151,000. Total estimate including contingency is \$2.928 million with our total allocated budget at \$2.95 million. I just wanted to point out in that paragraph below that we were here last year at roughly the same time and we presented a cost estimate of roughly \$3.4 million. The numbers seem to be a little bit less at this point but I put a big asterisk next to that because we haven't yet gone out to bid. We also requested that we come back in front of you once we receive those bid numbers to substantiate that and we will do that at the next meeting should it be necessary and the numbers come in higher than that estimate.

Chairman O'Neil asked from our end we have approved bonding up to \$3.4 million.

Mr. Clougherty answered actually I would technically have to look at the start-up. I don't know if Sam or Bob have that information but I believe the start-up read that we would go out to bid and then come back to you and report.

Alderman Shea asked, Tim, when you give these figures they are predicated upon what.

Mr. Clougherty answered they are based on historical construction costs that come from our consultants. They know historically that X number of square feet of building is going to cost X number of dollars per square foot for heating and air conditioning and what have you and they work constantly to keep those numbers up-to-date. Obviously economic conditions vary and the different players that you have bidding against each other can put a flux on those prices as well as...you know we see hazardous materials in there that can run array at times.

Alderman Shea asked when you go out for bid, how many do you usually have bid on this. Five or ten companies?

Mr. Clougherty answered a project of this magnitude we typically see a minimum of three and a maximum of six or seven.

Alderman Shea asked and usually do you find that depending on the amount of work that they have that you get a better bid back from them or is it kind of like they give you a bid and then you have to sort of negotiate with them in terms of what you really want done rather than what they would like to do. Is that how it works?

Mr. Clougherty answered no not really. What we do is we try to spend the time up front to accurately define the scope of the project through the plans and specifications so there isn't a lot of question about exactly what we want. Exactly what we want should be identified in those plans and specifications. Should we come in over budget, say it was \$3.1 million, then we may sit down with that low bidder and try to negotiate a less comprehensive scope of work or change in materials or something like that to bring it under budget but obviously we don't like to do that.

Alderman Shea responded you said overbid. Overbid in my opinion would be over \$3.4 million. You are saying overbid as far as your total budget is that correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied right. If the Committee is looking at that as the \$3.4 million that is fine.

Alderman Lopez stated two things. I believe, and Carol can check it out, but I believe we took \$300,000 out of that \$3.4 million for something and I can't remember exactly what it was for but I am sure that Sam and Bob can figure it out. Do you know?

Chairman O'Neil replied I honestly don't remember. Does anybody over on the far side remember that?

Mr. Clougherty stated I think it went to the South Main Fire Station.

Alderman Lopez responded yes that is where it was. We took \$300,000 out of there.

Chairman O'Neil asked so it is actually \$3.1 million then.

Alderman Lopez stated yes and although we did say later on that we would find the other \$300,000, I would have to throw that in there. I just want to keep that in the right perspective. The next question I have is every project we get and Alderman O'Neil always brings this up, is always overbid. Now the question I have for you is if that happens in this case and you take items 1-6, if it is too high and as you just heard we need more money for more projects, is there anything in here that you would come back and say we can only do this for this or do you have to do the whole pie here in order to accomplish this all?

Mr. Clougherty responded there are definitely alternatives that we can look at shaving back in order to make at least a majority of the project move forward. As you may recall, the primary driving force of this project was Item 1, which was the heating and HVAC. Obviously we consult with our architect as well as our exterior building consultant to prioritize these things but I think that number one would still be at the forefront of everybody's thoughts.

Chairman O'Neil stated two, three and four were kind of if the project allowed for them to be done they made sense to do it this same time but they possibly could be if we had to to meet a budget number one or all of them or parts of them could be removed.

Mr. Clougherty responded they could be removed. I am not exactly sure where we would recommend at this point.

Chairman O'Neil stated or it could be something that is not even on this list.

Mr. Clougherty responded it could be. It could be changing from ABC manufacturer to XYZ on a certain portion of the HVAC system to bring the number down a little bit.

Alderman Garrity stated when this project came forward it was to put the AC in the library. I am kind of surprised that we are going to clean the outside of the building for \$150,000. Is that part of the project?

Mr. Clougherty responded yes actually it is. When we came back last year there were a number of items on our Facilities Division CIP request that we folded into this project to get some economies of scale from the bidding process, the consultants, the design, the whole nine yards as far as that goes. That is that rain gutter reconstruction, stair reconstruction and the exterior cleaning. What we have done in the process is done an intensive evaluation of the exterior of the building. I don't know how familiar you all are with it but when you go down Pine Street and you look at the top of the building, the dental work, that stuff is in very bad shape and something needs to be done to arrest that. That is one of those things that has to be prioritized as we look at the maintenance of that facility.

Alderman Garrity stated but when I look at number four, exterior cleaning of the building, I think you are going to bring a power washer down there for \$150,000 and clean the outside of the building. It doesn't say anything about repointing anything.

Mr. Clougherty responded because of the nature of the building, the age and the condition, it is a little bit more technical than just power washing the building but I would agree with you that describing it as exterior cleaning of the building at six figures is a scary proposition.

Chairman O'Neil asked you are saying that some of these things were identified as other projects in your department and through efficiencies the intent was to get them done in one project.

Mr. Clougherty answered we are going to have to put it out to bid at some point through our office so it helps us to get it all done.

Chairman O'Neil stated if there are no more questions on the library, we will move to the South Main Street Fire Station.

Mr. Clougherty stated as we are all aware, the project is pretty extensive. It is pretty much a gut of the interior of the station. We are about 95% designed. I believe we got somewhat final plans today. We are getting ready to go out to bid. Rather than running through all of the line items, our total base estimate right now is \$1.46 million and our budget is \$1.6 million. Again, those are estimates based on our architect's findings, our consultants and we are going to have to wait to see exactly what those costs will be at the end of the day once we have bids in hand. One of the items that Alderman Lopez brought up is how can we scale back on the project should it come in over our budget. Those are identified as the alternates that you will see there on Page 2. We have taken some steps in advance to put those out in our bid documents. We are going to do the same thing with the library. We just haven't refined them exactly where they are but should it come in more than our \$1.6 million than those would be some of the items that we could potentially cut back on.

Alderman Shea stated when Engine 7 was renovated the Deputy Chief was instrumental in that particular project. Are you working with him in that regard?

Mr. Clougherty answered every week.

Alderman Shea responded good because he is very capable.

Chairman O'Neil stated that would be Deputy Chief Monnelly.

Mr. Clougherty stated we are working with Deputy Chief Monnelly and Dave Albin and the rest of the folks.

Alderman Shea asked what is going to happen exactly. Are they going to put an addition on? Are they going to renovate the present building over there in Ward 10?

Mr. Clougherty answered there is no addition that is currently planned. Nothing outside of the confines of the original footprint of the building. What the current plan is is to basically remove the interior partitions, those are the non-load bearing walls, provide a

new kitchen, new lounge areas, and a new entry area. We would be taking one of the vehicle...the apparatus space because they are only using two of the apparatus spaces. We would expand into that area for some of the services and then also upstairs there would be complete new bedrooms, as well as a cardio training area and a weight training area with centralized laundry and bathroom facilities. On the first floor in the apparatus bay they would get new concrete topping on the floors, decontamination rooms, shower areas and things like that. Basically we will be modernizing the facility. Eric has taken the consultant, our architect, over to Engine 7 to see the renovations that were done, again with Deputy Chief Monnelly to make sure that they have an idea about the line of renovations that we would like to see.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct to say that the electrical and mechanical systems are pretty poor there.

Mr. Clougherty answered they are getting replaced in their entirety so yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that is a driving force behind this as well.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes that is all part of it as well. Most of the plumbing is getting replaced. I don't want to say that every line is getting replaced but new toilets and bathrooms like I mentioned. One other area that we are looking at that you will see identified as alternate #1 is installation of a training room in the basement and renovation of that entire basement adding some interior partitions and things like that. So if the project came in over the allocation, that would be one area that we could look to scale back on.

Alderman Shea asked you are due to start according to this in April and it should extend for how long.

Mr. Clougherty answered we are looking toward the end of the calendar year. We are thinking it is probably a seven or eight month completion. We would probably be looking to occupy the place in December/January.

Alderman Shea asked would it be out of operation entirely during that period of time.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes it will. It is my understanding that that has been accounted for.

Alderman Smith stated I am very interested...you are 95% done with the design. When are the bids...the bids must be close to coming out because I am very concerned as you know we are going to be losing a ladder truck and fire service in the neighborhood and I am very interested in getting this project started as soon as possible. I know you put mid-April but when will the bids be going out since your design is almost complete.

Mr. Clougherty responded we anticipate having the design complete in about a week and receiving bids about three weeks after we put it on the street. So optimistically four weeks. It may slip to five from now so you are looking at the middle of March.

Alderman Smith stated with your expertise in bidding I have the same concern as all of my constituents here where it seems like everything that goes out for bid goes over, like Raco-Theodore pool, which is absolutely needed because we are losing water and we are losing money every year and it has been seven years. We put it out for bid and it is overbid. Now what is your prognosis? With your expertise do you think this will come in underbid? I would think on a small project and I consider this small, \$1.6 million, that you would get quite a few bids. That is my own thinking. I don't know what you think about it.

Mr. Clougherty responded there is quite a bit of interest on the street because of the size of the project. It is not really small but it is not really big either. There are a lot of general contractors out there that cater to this price point so we are anticipating a lot of competition and going out at this time of year is advantageous for us. Mostly the smaller towns that have their bond votes in March haven't been out yet so the contractors still don't know exactly how much work they are going to have.

Alderman Smith asked have you talked or has Chief Kane talked with the individuals who utilize this on a daily basis, the firemen.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes they have been involved in the process since Day 1.

Chairman O'Neil stated first of all we got the budget number up to \$1.6 million by you folks coming back and thinking the original budget number was a little low. Am I correct?

Mr. Clougherty responded yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated so we are hoping that this thing is going to come in somewhere around this \$1.6 million and you have already identified at least \$100,000 that may have to be reduced from the project. I would like to just talk quickly about items 4, 5 and 6. The brick resurfacing is going to be to put brick on that addition that is now block?

Mr. Clougherty responded yes. We would like to try to pretty that up a bit and make it more...

Chairman O'Neil interjected it does look like and I don't want to say an eyesore but it does look like it was an afterthought. So the intent will be to match it with the rest of the building?

Mr. Clougherty replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated item 6 says owner costs includes testing, furnishings and fit-ups. Can you tell me generally speaking what that is? New equipment for the facility?

Mr. Clougherty responded it is basically the furnishings associated with the station itself. I am not sure if Eric can jump in here.

Eric Krueger, Facilities Supervisor, stated the owner's furnishings are things like beds, kitchen tables, microwave, washer/dryer and that type of thing. All of the things that it takes to fit up the fire station.

Chairman O'Neil stated just for clarification, the washers and dryers have to do with their firefighting equipment, which is a significant issue over there right now. They bring in what I guess you could call contaminated clothing and they end up washing it on the apparatus floor or something.

Mr. Clougherty replied actually there is a decontamination program that is going to be just on the south side of the northern most bay.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess the one that most stands out is the security systems. I know that I brought this up when we did the East Industrial Park Road fire station and for some reason I think of a number of \$15,000 out there but can you tell me why we need \$40,000+ worth of security systems in a fire station that they are either at or if they are out there is nothing to steal?

Mr. Clougherty responded the security systems are...we basically consulted with the Security Manager to come up with the program for those. You are talking about motion detectors and cameras and the video recorders and the like.

Chairman O'Neil asked in a firehouse.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated boy I tell you that seems a little outrageous to me. Again, I can see the need for security systems at the Central Fire Station. It is the main dispatch and we have our main computer systems in the City downstairs there but I honestly cannot...I have a hard time with security...are we talking card access and all of that here?

Mr. Clougherty responded I don't recall specifically but that is possible.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just can't see why. It is either the firefighters are on duty or if they are gone and somebody breaks in I am not really sure why someone would want to break in to an unmanned firehouse but I don't know what they are going to steal?

Mr. Sheppard stated if I can clarify what Tim is saying is we have been asked to take a look at security on any project that we do and the City does have a Security Manager that works out of the Human Resources Department and we rely on that person to put together security plans for buildings. You know when you say why does it need six cameras or five cameras, that is not a determination made by us because we are not the experts. We are relying on the City's experts to do that and that is what was proposed as part of this and that is why it is on here.

Chairman O'Neil asked but there is no basis to back it up. You are thrown a...who came up with the number?

Mr. Sheppard answered it was a proposal that he received from a private company.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess in some ways I think...I have heard of abuse with some of these security systems. They are being used more to manage manpower and not people trying to cause physical harm to the building. I just personally have an issue with it and having been in not only this firehouse but many firehouses around the City I don't know why we need this extravagant security system. I just can't understand it. I don't know how the rest of the Committee feels about it but to me that is a waste of taxpayer's money. That \$43,000 could be going into something else that would make that a better fire station – more livable for the firefighters. Maybe there is something that we could be doing on the electrical or mechanical end that we can't now. I have a real problem with that. I have no idea what it is based on. Do we have some kind of plan in the City that says if we are doing a fire station this is what we are supposed to do or if we are doing a school...the fire station we are supposed to do A or a school we are supposed to do B or a maintenance garage we are supposed to do C?

Mr. Sheppard stated currently there is no policy in the City regarding security in any building, including the schools. As I said earlier, we rely on the City Security Manager to consult with us and inform us what he feels is necessary for any of these buildings. I don't want to say we are at his mercy but basically where there is no policy what he says basically goes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I will tell you that you don't do electrical that way and you don't do mechanical that way. There is documentation on why you need certain things or structural and I really don't see security any different unless...I have a real problem with that. I have to be honest with you. Again, I caught it too late on the East Industrial Park Fire Station or I would have put up more of a...made it more of an issue there. Somehow

we have to come up with...I mean we are doing plans on everything else except this and we just throw \$43,000 at it. I have an issue with that.

Alderman Shea asked what is the alternative not having anything that requires security. Do the other fire stations have nothing in their fire stations that equate to this?

Mr. Clougherty responded I think there is a plan to bring all fire stations up to the same level. I don't know exactly how many have been executed at this point.

Alderman Shea stated let's look at Homeland Security and see if they will throw in a certain amount of money towards this. If it is a necessity according to Homeland Security than we should put it in and let them pay for it. If it isn't, I agree with Alderman O'Neil. Why should we have it at this station?

Chairman O'Neil stated for the life of me, Alderman Shea, I think if we go over to the fire station in your ward I think it is generally secured, not with cameras and not with card access and if you want to go inside you ring the doorbell and somebody comes out and gets it. When they leave I don't know what there is to steal there.

Alderman Shea asked how many guys are there. I know everyone is important there but it is like two bays isn't it?

Chairman O'Neil responded yes and they have like five firefighters I believe.

Alderman Shea stated it is not like...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I just have a problem with...we seem to be running wild on this security stuff without a game plan and if I recall at Gill Stadium they wanted us to put up some prison fencing or something that was absolutely ridiculous.

Alderman Shea responded then a motion would be in order for this to be reconsidered.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't want to hold up the project but I have a strong issue. I would also like to, at some point, see what our game plan is and if there isn't one we need to have one.

Alderman Lopez stated I have worked with the Security individual for four years as Chairman of the Human Resources Committee. I think one of the most important things that we have to remember is that the department head is responsible for the building. Leo Bernier is responsible for City Hall. If Leo Bernier wants security, he goes down there and they put up cameras or whatever for the situation if the money is there. But sometimes the department head has to have a certain type of security. We are talking about a fire station. I would say that all of the fire stations have some type of security or

want to come up to a standard of security on all fire stations. I would suggest that we get an established policy from Red Robidas, who is the Security Officer, and have him make some type of presentation to us so that we fully understand because he has been directed to do security in the City because department heads, even though they are responsible for it, they in turn come in and say like the School Department there was a plan to have cards to get into the school for all of the students. That was in the planning stage. I really believe we need to have a clear understanding from the department head who is requesting this new fire station and from the security officer and then what the policy is going to be

Chairman O'Neil responded I agree with you. Do you guys know if this was a request from the Fire Department?

Mr. Clougherty replied I would have to assume that they were consulted on the breadth of security.

Chairman O'Neil responded I certainly would like to see if we have budgeted other money to do other fire stations. Again, I think you have to be practical with this and I don't believe that spending money for card access systems and security cameras at a neighborhood fire station is the best use of taxpayer money when we could be doing something else with it. I would love to see this policy because I didn't know it existed. I have been on this Board a long time and I don't remember passing a security policy so I would be very interested in seeing where this security policy is. 9/11 happened and we do have to take some measures but I don't believe putting security cameras and card access in a fire station makes it a safer building.

Alderman Smith stated I would suggest that you get together with Joe Kane and Red Robidas to straighten this out because you are only doing what you think should be in the contract and if it is a request from Joe Kane or from Red Robidas then we can take it up because it is alternate #4, the last alternate that they requested in the potential bid amount. I have to agree with you, I have been over at the station and it is 113 years old, the oldest station in the City and it needs replenishing but when there is a fire there is nobody in the house and the doors are open and I don't know what anybody is going to take – a bed or something? It is a neighborhood firehouse. It is really in the neighborhood. It is one of the few neighborhood firehouses left. I would suggest that is the way to go.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you get together with them and report back to us. I don't think we want to hold up the process. They need to go out to bid as soon as they can on this and shouldn't be waiting to report back to us on this. I don't think we need a motion on that. That is continuing the path you already planned. I would entertain a motion...we have to get a handle...this security thing is bothering me. I don't want to spend money just for the sake of spending money in City facilities. There has to be needs. I don't want to bring Ron Ludwig into this. I can only guess, Ron, what is going

on up at your new facility. Is there a significant security cost? I know that it is after the fact that I am asking this question but seeing this I can only guess what is going on up there.

Ron Ludwig, Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Director responded obviously we have security concerns and Red Robidas has been involved in that process but you have to remember that in this particular project there is a 70% ownership to a tenant, as well as the City so we have knocked the pricetag of the security system down significantly in-house.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you know what it is off the top of your head.

Mr. Ludwig answered we are still dealing with a couple of different companies. I think Mr. Robidas came in with Pelmac. We looked at other companies as well and we are still waiting for them to ring in for some competitive pricing. We have cut it about in half so far.

Chairman O'Neil asked what was the number. Do you remember?

Mr. Ludwig answered it wasn't above \$20,000 and we expect it to be a little less.

Chairman O'Neil asked was that the number you started with originally.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we need to get a hold of this security issue. I would entertain a motion that we get an update at our next meeting. I see that they are responsible for the buildings.

Alderman Lopez moved to get a copy of the written security policy from Red Robidas and request that he attend the next CIP meeting. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Sheppard asked is it my understanding that this Committee, now that they have had this update, they asked us for an update before we went out to bid to make sure that we had the money but can we go out to bid and award these contracts subject to us living within the budget that has been presented tonight and possibly hold off on awarding the security part of the South Main Street Fire Station but if we live within budget...I just want to keep the projects moving. If we need to come back to this Committee before we award it then that is potentially another step.

Chairman O'Neil answered I believe the intent is for us to be tracking how things are going. It appears you have things under control. If it comes in higher than you have to come in. I don't believe you have to come back...

Alderman Lopez interjected there is just one question I have about the \$3.4 million for the library. It is \$3.1 million so you would have to come back if it is over that.

Mr. Sheppard responded right.

Alderman Lopez stated we took \$300,000 out of that so Bob MacKenzie and Finance would have to find another \$300,000 if you come back with bids more than \$3.1 million.

Mr. Sheppard replied we understand that. Just to clarify I believe that it might be \$2.95 million not \$3.1 million.

Alderman Lopez stated whatever it is.

TABLED ITEMS

20. Discussion of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Master Plan.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Mr. Ludwig stated on this item, as you know I don't want to belabor the process but we did have five consultants respond to the RFP. We shortlisted them down. They were in a range between \$75,000 to \$90,000. We actually interviewed three consultants. They were right around \$80,000 or between \$80,000 and \$83,000. We have that process narrowed down to two consultants. I have maybe one or two more phone calls to make to try to make them bump heads in terms of giving us a little bit more for our dollar within the budgeted amount in terms of maybe a maintenance management study as a part of the project but other than that we are ready to move now that the Committee has basically approved funds for the project. I would like to say that within a week we are going to have somebody under contract.

Alderman O'Neil asked and you will report back to us at the next CIP meeting.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to receive and file.

Mr. Ludwig asked before we actually award the contract do you want us to come back here.

Chairman O'Neil replied if you are within budget, which I think is \$90,000...

Mr. Ludwig interjected but do you want us to come back and let you know who the consultant is.

Chairman O'Neil stated as an FYI if you want at the next meeting to just say we selected this firm and these are the items and the scope. I think just an update would be helpful.

21. Synthetic turf maintenance at Gill Stadium, West Memorial Field, and the Clem Lemire Sports Complex at Memorial High School and a list of additional capital items needed to properly operate Gill Stadium.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Smith asked Mr. MacKenzie did you find any additional monies so we can have some equipment for Gill Stadium because April is coming quickly.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there is no cash available and we had looked at bond balances although much of the equipment that they are requesting could not be bonded. We had anticipated actually bringing that into the next year's FY06 CIP budget to see if we could fund those because we have not found...certainly the original request was \$93,000 and it might be slightly less than that now but we have not located any money for that at the present time.

Chairman O'Neil stated we asked the department to prioritize. Didn't we drop the possible...I think we agreed that the lighting service agreement has to be done? As a matter of fact, he has already entered into it. We have to do that. The utility vehicle was needed whether it is spring, summer or fall. It was about \$35,000 or something like that.

Mr. Ludwig responded not to interrupt you but the two biggest things that we need at this point and I am going to stick with the...again we did bring a small piece of equipment down from the golf course and used it this fall to remove the pitcher's mound and the sliding boxes but it really isn't the right type of equipment. Down the road we should have a balloon tired rubber vehicle that can travel on that turf without causing any damage to it.

Chairman O'Neil replied but that particular item for now if you had to get one you could rent for a day or a week or something.

Mr. Ludwig responded we can but down the road I think it is something that the ballpark should have.

Chairman O'Neil stated the first two on the list absolutely have to happen.

Mr. Ludwig responded the Enterprise had already paid for the lighting contract.

Alderman Smith asked, Ron, on the original list the tire backhoe was \$29,265. Mr. MacKenzie, it seems like we find funds and we transferred funds from balances earlier this evening. We can't come up with \$29,265 for a piece of equipment? I will tell you what. The youth of the City of Manchester from Central and Memorial are going to be playing baseball there and that field has to be addressed. You know we set it up for football and even if we rent there is a charge for rental and it is going to take...I was there when they removed them and it is going to take them two or three days to put them back in.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the funds we reallocated earlier was HUD CDBG. In this particular case those funds cannot be used for this type of normal municipal equipment so it has to come out of either cash or some type of grant and we didn't identify any type of grant funds for this. We have been checking because the Board has asked us to look at cash projects. I think at one point we had identified up to \$10,000 in miscellaneous cash balances but that clearly wouldn't be enough to attempt to fund all of the projects that they were asking for at Gill.

Alderman Smith stated not to interrupt you but what I am looking for is some equipment right now to maintain what we have. I hate to lose the condition that Gill Stadium is in now and I am going to follow up with the Enterprise system because as you know that is one of my pet peeves. I would like to see Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise completely so it is funded on an annual basis by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen through CIP.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Smith I think we had a discussion and the two most important items were the field lighting service contract, which he has already...

Mr. Ludwig interjected that is done.

Chairman O'Neil responded yes but you are borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. That is really a Gill Stadium expense. We really need to come up with the \$23,000. I think the Gator Utility Vehicle is just handy for every day operations. My recommendation would be let's at least start by looking for approximately \$33,000, which gets him the things he needs yearly and then work on...for instance I still believe for now until we find money if he needs a balloon tire tractor he can rent one for a week or something and that might do the job. I would like to see us concentrate on \$33,000 for now.

Alderman Lopez asked does that get us there.

Chairman O'Neil answered well it is a step in the right direction. It doesn't get them everything they need but at least it gets them...lighting is needed three seasons of the year as is the utility vehicle.

Mr. Ludwig stated the lighting we were going to lose the timeframe that Musco was going to allow us to take advantage of purchase of the agreements.

Chairman O'Neil responded we are hurting the Enterprise even more by not following through on the lighting contract on our end.

Alderman Lopez asked what is the number, Mr. Ludwig. I would like to know the minimum amount you need and then the total number.

Chairman O'Neil answered the total number is \$86,053. My opinion for now if we do items 1 and 2, which are his first two priorities, that is \$33,100 approximately. That would be a step in the right direction.

Alderman Lopez stated I might have a solution.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is your solution.

Alderman Lopez stated well it will have to wait another couple of weeks.

Alderman Shea stated in the interim I am going to ask Bob MacKenzie if he can, in addition to the \$10,000 come up with another \$21,000 or...

Chairman O'Neil interjected \$23,000 I think it is approximately.

Alderman Shea stated right and report back in a month or whenever.

Mr. MacKenzie responded we will scan through all of the projects and provide a memo for you.

Alderman Shea stated in the meantime Alderman Lopez is going to be trying to shake, rattle and roll to get a little bit more money so that you will have enough money.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to have Mr. MacKenzie look into finding an additional \$21,000 and report back at the next CIP meeting.

Alderman Smith stated as you all know we asked the CIP office to discuss the elimination of Gill Stadium from the Enterprise and I believe they met with the parties and I guess there was some disagreement between the Finance Department and the Planning Board and the other particulars surrounding removing this from the Enterprise. I am not giving up on this at all. I can't believe when you have a growth of \$21,000 a year that you would call it an Enterprise when now we are going to have to put additional funds into Gill Stadium to maintain the \$4 million bond that we did for the stadium. I believe this is the time now to make sure...it is the Aldermen's responsibility on a yearly basis to make sure that Gill Stadium is upkeep and not anybody else's. I would like to have you reply to that, please.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I have no particular issue with removing Gill Stadium from the Enterprise. It certainly doesn't even come close to paying its own way. Just to clarify I know that another department does have an issue with it but we have no issue with removing it from the Enterprise because it simply doesn't come close to paying its own way.

Chairman O'Neil asked could we get a motion...we have already done this once but apparently it didn't go anywhere because we haven't gotten a report back on it.

Mr. Ludwig stated I have to say that I did facilitate a meeting with Finance. Mr. Clougherty was out sick that day. I did meet with Mr. Sherman relative to this issue. We showed him the numbers for this year and basically the way that we have divided Gill Stadium up between service contracts and School District chargeback, the old number and what last year basically the Board of Mayor and Aldermen had agreed to fund. Right now it is about a 50/50 split in terms of what we charge the School District for use at Gill or anybody else who uses it. That is a chargeback. I would think that the department, whether it is going to become 100% a general fund facility again, which is fine with me, would still be asked to track School District costs in terms of what...just for, I don't know, whether there is an S-22 form out there or something that we would probably be asked to charge you for. I would say that the Aldermen have taken a great step in terms of providing general fund dollars so that any other general user outside of the School District can basically come in to Gill and use it at virtually no cost or very little.

Chairman O'Neil asked haven't we done this in some ways. It seems like six or eight years ago we took the...the pools were in the Enterprise at one point and we pulled them out. You must have been charging salaries to the Enterprise back then – no full-time salaries probably but somehow we pulled...this isn't on you but more on why because we have done it before and life has gone on and the kids are using the pools and all of that. It can be done. I don't know why this is...

Mr. Ludwig interjected the difference with the pools, Alderman O'Neil, was the actual budget allocation to run the swimming pools in that particular year as was estimated was

actually given to the School District to pay to us. It was just a flow that the Aldermen actually said to the School District if it takes \$250,000 to run swimming pools this season we will give it to the School District. The School District would give it to us to run swimming pools. It was just a matter of in one pocket and out the other.

Chairman O'Neil stated this chargeback thing continues to be a...I will tell you that City government isn't better for it. Anyway, can we remake the motion that we made some months ago that they get together and report back to us?

Alderman Lopez responded I don't know what part of that language they didn't understand in the first place.

Chairman O'Neil replied well obviously they didn't understand it.

Alderman Smith stated in my meeting with you that particular morning, Bob, you said that there was a disagreement between the Finance Department and you and in that particular thing I asked you about the Enterprise system and if you had met and so forth. What is the prognosis or do you think it is useless to meet? I don't want to ask somebody to meet if the end result is the same.

Mr. MacKenzie responded I would say that the majority of that meeting, the vast majority of the time spent was talking about how to fund the improvements needed and not on whether Gill should or shouldn't be in the Enterprise. So most of the meeting was consumed by, as I remember Ron, how do we fund it and not whether it should be in the Enterprise.

Chairman O'Neil asked why are we concentrating on how to fund improvements. We just did \$4 million worth of improvements?

Mr. MacKenzie responded this is the equipment. I'm sorry. This is the \$93,000 down to \$86,000 that was...

Mr. Ludwig interjected the last meeting I had with Randy Sherman was relative to Gill being either in the Enterprise or in the general fund. That was the discussion.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I wasn't at that meeting.

Mr. Ludwig replied you weren't at that meeting Bob and I apologize. You should have been there.

Chairman O'Neil stated we may have an answer from Finance.

Tobias Sventesson stated I don't think I have an answer for you. I talked to Randy today about this and he mentioned that he had met with Mr. Ludwig about it. I don't have an answer but I will talk to Randy again about it tomorrow.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think the intent of the Committee...I don't believe we brought this to the full Board or the Mayor is we want to see a plan to get this out of the Enterprise.

Alderman Lopez stated I think what is happening here is a delay tactic. The Mayor is going to be putting his budget together here soon so in order to make sure that we get some answers I would like to make a motion that we move Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise and put it in the general fund.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Garrity asked are we going to start that next fiscal year or when it gets full Board approval.

Alderman Lopez stated we will get some answers.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think we would be talking about our next fiscal year. At least if we send this and can we put this as a separate agenda item so we are not pulling it off of the consent agenda? We really have to have this discussion at the full Board level.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

22. Communication from Dayton and Concepcion Spaulding regarding drainage issues in the Pasture Drive development area.

This item remained tabled.

23. Petition for discontinuance of a portion of ROW at 466 So. Willow Street submitted by Frederick Nixon.

This item remained tabled.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee